

## CHRISTIAN SCIENCE LECTURE

Edward A. Kimball, C. S. D., a member of the Christian Science Board of Lectureship of the First Church of Christ, Scientist, delivered an address at the Ravinia Theatre Sunday afternoon last, at 3:30 o'clock.

Mr. Kimball has often been mentioned as one of the ablest and most candid of the Christian Science expounders. The theatre was crowded with a very attentive and appreciative audience. It would be impossible within the limits of our space to give to this lecture anything like a fair review and, therefore, we refrain from making any specific comments.

The speaker was full of his subject and evidently a master in it; at the same time we must confess that much of the discourse was not to us entirely coherent or clear. Possibly this was our weakness and not his fault. Every person, however intelligent or strong-minded, is somewhat colored in his convictions, especially of religion, by previous teaching and training. Much of the Doctor's discourse was concerning Christ, his mission and power in the world. If we understood him correctly, he denied the divinity of Christ, but taught that he was inspired and endowed by divine spirit and power. Perhaps we do not correctly represent the speaker but certainly have no desire to misrepresent him and only speak as we understood.

Our theory of Christ briefly summed up is substantially as follows: All human beings have sinned; that is, broken the law of God. The penalty is spiritual death. Without some forfeiture God cannot pardon the offender and maintain his justice and perfectness as God. Therefore there must be a penalty, otherwise God's law is not law but simply exhortation. The penalty to be complete must be perfect else inefficient. Jesus Christ by His death paid the penalty whereby we may be saved and God's law upheld. The acceptance must be our voluntary act, for if forced upon us we are not free moral agents.

The speaker asked: "Why educate the race to be afraid of God? To be afraid of heaven, hell, and devil?" Why, we ask in answer, are these doctrines so unmistakably

taught in the Bible? And why are children taught to fear their parents? And why are lawbreakers in society taught to fear the law and the agents of the law? "Fear God and keep His commandments" means to us fear to offend a loving father by breaking His laws. Again the speaker puts into the mouth of other people these words: "I never liked this heaven and hell; I never liked the agony and doom." Of course offenders never like to pay the penalties incident to their offences; but it seems to us not a matter of what we like or dislike. What is taught in the Bible from Genesis to Revelation? And if the Bible be not the word of God, then whose word is it and what is the word and spirit and law of God?

However, it is not our purpose here to make any attempt to controvert or discuss the speaker's views. We are not either by training or disposition inclined to antagonize other people in their religious views any more than we would wish to have them dictate to us. We only throw out these suggestions as matters of public interest, as we trust, and particularly to inspire on the part of our readers careful, systematic thinking and living. We must say in conclusion that, while we do not admit that the Christian Scientists have taught the world a great, new truth (for some of us already knew it,) we do frankly admit and do so with great pleasure that they have emphasized and are emphasizing an invaluable lesson to the world in calling attention to the importance of forgetting ourselves, our ills and troubles, thereby leaving us more time to preach and practice the genuine spirit of altruism so abundantly exemplified in the life and teachings of Christ.

**FOR SALE**—A very elegant dark oak dining room table and china cabinet to match, and some other articles cheap. Inquire at this office 18.

**LOST**—A ladies' jacket; mixed goods; brown velvet at the neck. Liberal reward paid if returned to NEWS-LETTER office.

### FOR RENT

A new modern 12-room house; electric lights, gas, 2 bathrooms, laundry, hot water and hot air furnace and all conveniences. Address B. F. Gump, Highland Park.

## SAFE TALK ABOUT CHICAGO

Proper Reasons Why Voters Should Vote for Constitutional Amendment.

While all classes, parties and interests in Chicago are advocating the constitutional amendment in order to get a new charter for that city, the intelligent part of the community does not argue that a new charter, however wisely framed, is going to do everything for Chicago. After the new charter is adopted there will be the same struggle between honesty and corruption, the patriotic civic spirit and the element that is in municipal politics for revenue only. Good citizenship will be just as essential under a favorable charter as an unfavorable one. No one in Chicago is denying that.

Neither is so much stress laid on the argument that broader charter powers will increase the already rapid growth of the city. While there is a good deal of boasting, mainly in the newspapers, about the size and growth of the city, Chicago has in fact reached the point where it realizes that bigness is not the only nor the main thing to be desired. The real object of the amendment and of the expected charter is to improve the quality of the city rather than to increase its size. It is not agreeable to the people who have their residences and business interests there to hear Chicago continually flouted before the world as a ragged, unkempt, over-grown place where it is dangerous to be abroad in the night. Chicago will grow in all probabilities without the concerted efforts of the local civic, business and political organizations. It has a vast momentum, but it will not grow cleaner, and brighter, and safer, and more sightly in the same unassisted way. The people want a better city rather than a larger one. They want a city that it will be a greater pleasure to live in, to do business in, and to entertain guests and strangers in. In short, they want a city to admire and for some other qualities than mere size.

Therefore, they ask the people of the state to vote for the pending constitutional amendment and thus aid them in their efforts.

### ABOUT AMENDMENTS TO THE STATE CONSTITUTION

The first amendment to the present constitution of Illinois was in 1878, eight years after the adoption of the constitution. It enabled the legislature to pass laws concerning the construction of drains, ditches and levees, and was of special benefit to those sections of the state containing swamp lands and marshes. The second amendment was in 1880 and applied to the election of county officers. The third amendment was in 1884, and defined the veto power of the governor. The fourth was in 1886, and laid a prohibition upon the present labor contract system. The fifth was in 1890 and authorized the city of Chicago to issue \$5,000,000 of bonds, the proceeds of which were devoted to the World's Columbian Exposition.

The pending amendment to the constitution will, if ratified, be the sixth, and, while it applies only to the city of Chicago, it is not the less important. That city needs a new charter which will bestow broader powers of local self-government, and it will be to the advantage of the state at large to have the amendment adopted. Practically all the members of the last legislature take this view of the matter, as they can see from their experience that it will relieve future legislatures from many bills concerning Chicago.

There is really no opposition to the measure. The only danger lies in the possible negligence of the voters. The electors throughout the state should take a special care in marking their "little ballot" in favor of this amendment.

## BROADER POWERS FOR CHICAGO

Vote for Constitutional Amendment and Avoid All Need of Another Convention.

The agitation for the adoption of the constitutional amendment this fall revives recollections of the constitutional convention of 1870. Of the seventy-nine members composing that convention more than forty have passed beyond. The youngest man in the convention was George R. Wendling, who subsequently achieved fame as a lecturer, and who now resides in Washington. One of the youngest members was George W. Wall, who was also a member of the convention of 1862, the constitution proposed by which failed of adoption by the people. Judge Wall is still comparatively a young man, and is now practicing law in Chicago. In a recent interview he stated that some of the provisions of the constitution which caused the warmest debates in the convention have since been the subjects of amendments. Of these questions perhaps the most important was that of special legislation. The prohibition placed by the convention against practically all special legislation is really the cause of Chicago's seeking an amendment now to enable the legislature to grant that city a special charter. Should the amendment carry it will apply only to the city of Chicago.

Chicago no doubt needs broader charter powers. She has had to go to the legislature too frequently for things that concern the people of that city alone, and it would be a relief to the whole state if she were given more authority over her own affairs. Some years ago Chicago agitated the question of a constitutional convention in order to secure these additional charter powers. It is much better that the city should get what it needs through an amendment. There is no demand by the state at large for a new constitution. The people feel that there would be too much risk and uncertainty, as well as expense, attending a constitutional convention. Undoubtedly they will prefer to vote for the pending amendment, and if it is adopted, as it should be, there is not likely to be any agitation for another constitutional convention for many years to come.

### Fight Getting Too Strenuous.

All the president's admirers insist that he dearly loves a fight, but there are indications that the Democrats are trying to please him too well in that line.—Washington Post.

### Desperate.

"Can you make both ends meet, Pat?"

"Shure and I can't make one end meet!"—Town Topics.

### Wise Young Man.

Elvira—And did he kiss you before your chaperon? Marcia—Oh, no. He was wise enough to kiss her first.—Columbus Dispatch.

### His Idea of It.

Caller—Why, I'm Irish, Bobby. I was really born in Ireland. Bobby—Oh, you're in disguise, then. Caller—In disguise? Bobby—Sure! You ain't got any red chin whiskers nor a pipe stick in your hat!—Philadelphia Press.